



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,045	02/21/2007	Kouji Matsushima	14875-157US1 C1-A0308P-US	9112
26161	7590	03/21/2011	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. (BO) P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			SKELDING, ZACHARY S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1644	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/21/2011	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/574,045	MATSUSHIMA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	ZACHARY SKELDING	1644

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) ZACHARY SKELDING. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Ryan McQuaid. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 10 February 2011
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*Called applicant's representative, Mr. McQuade around February 2, 2011 and asked him to query applicant to see if they would be interested in making claim amendments to put the claims into condition for allowance. In particular, discussed with applicant's representative amending the claims via examiner's amendment to be limited to claims 34 and 35. However, after consultation with applicant, applicant's representative indicated that applicant would rather continue prosecution rather than amend the claims at this time.*

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Zachary Skelding/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1644

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)